

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW

Attendees, Date and Type of Interview

The interview was conducted on July 21, 2010 and attended by Applicant's representatives Daniel E. Altman and Raymond D. Smith and Examiners Jennifer A. Berrios and Shanon A Foley.

Exhibits and/or Demonstrations

None

Identification of Claims Discussed

Claims 1, 8 and 9.

Identification of Prior Art Discussed

Hashmi et al. (WO 01/07079)

Tamura et al. (1975 *Immunology* 28:909-924); and

Folds et al. (1983 *J Clin Microbiol* 18:321-326)

Proposed Amendments

After reviewing the prior art and the specification, Applicant's representative believed that the main focus of the invention was on increasing an antibody response to an antigen, and that good support for an argument of unexpected results could be provided for a claim limited to "stimulating an antibody response to an antigen in an animal." Accordingly, Applicant's representatives proposed to the Examiner that the claims be limited accordingly.

Principal Arguments and Other Matters

Applicant's representatives noted that Tamura discloses two doses of SRBC, and that anti-SRBC antibodies are produced. However, the second dose of SRBC is not necessarily higher than the first dose. Moreover, the first dose is SRBC alone while the second dose is of SRBC conjugated to TNP. Thus, the second dose of SRBC is not of the same antigen as the first dose.

The Examiner indicated that the dependent claims would need to be revised in order to be consistent with the proposed amended Claim 1. In this regard, the Examiner raised questions

concerning Claims 8 and 9, which refer to vaccines and immunizing agents. Accordingly, Applicant's representatives proposed to cancel Claims 8 and 9 so as to avoid the issue.

The Examiner indicated that Applicant would need to file a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in order to have the amendments entered and considered.

Results of Interview

Applicant's representatives agreed to submit a response that addresses the issues above, along with a RCE.